



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,821	09/30/2002	Hans-Jurgen Maier	5088	8018

26936 7590 01/13/2005

SHOEMAKER AND MATTARE, LTD
10 POST OFFICE ROAD - SUITE 110
SILVER SPRING, MD 20910

EXAMINER

KRISHNAN, GANAPATHY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1623

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/926,821

Applicant(s)

MAIER ET AL.

Examiner

Ganapathy Krishnan

Art Unit

1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152).
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1623

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed 10/21/2004 has been received, entered and carefully considered.

The following information provided in the amendment affects the instant application:

1. Claim 24 has been amended.
2. Remarks drawn to claim objections, rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, 35 USC 102 and 103.

Claims 15-34 are pending in the case.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U. S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Objections

The objection to claim 24 has been overcome by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejection of claim 24 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for lack of antecedent basis has been overcome by amendment. The following rejections are made of record.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 19, 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1623

Claims 19, 20 and 23 do not end with a period. It is not clear if any additional text is intended or if the claims end as recited. This renders the claims indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 15-22, 28 and 31-33 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Demopoulos (EP 0444000) has been overcome by arguments advanced by the applicants.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koji et al (JP 1192385 and English Abstract) in combination with Demopoulos (EP 0444000), Schleck et al (US 5,843,923), Rovati (US 3,683,076), The Merck Manual (12th Edition, 1996, page 393-393) all of record and Chiesi et al (WO 99/04765) and Stephan (US 5,171,571) newly cited.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1623

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 15 is drawn to a solid formulation of glucosamine sulfate or a mixed salt thereof in an effervescent preparation. Dependent claims 16-28 and 31 are drawn to the composition of claim 15 further comprising specific amounts of glucosamine sulfate, a fruit acid for storage stability, specific ratios of the glucosamine sulfate or mixed salt and fruit acid; wherein the fruit acid is hydroxylated and anhydrous and is an aliphatic carboxylic organic acid, wherein the mixed salt is glucosamine potassium chloride and wherein the composition further comprises an antioxidant. Claims 32-34 are drawn to the formulation of claim 15 produced by the method comprising spray drying.

Koji teaches a composition comprising glucosamine hydrochloride and an organic acid. The organic acid can be a 1-8 carbon mono, di or tricarboxylic acid or a hydroxyacid (english abstract). Koji's composition is stable even in the liquid form. The composition of Koji also comprises lemon juice (citric acid-an aliphatic hydroxylated carboxylic acid, see Japanese patent JP 11-92385, bottom of page 3) and ascorbic acid (antioxidant). However, Koji does not teach a solid composition comprising glucosamine sulfate or the use of mixed salts of glucosamine or the use of an antioxidant in the composition.

Demopoulos teaches a composition comprising glucosamine sulfate, ascorbic acid and calcium carbonate (see abstract, col. 2, line 40 through col.3, line 8). The composition is can be formed into a capsule or tablet (solid formulation, col. 7, lines 48-50). The formulation typically comprises 50mg to about 1500mg of glucosamine sulfate in a single dosage (col. 6, lines 32-38). The composition is in a highly storage stable form (col. 2, lines 40-42). The formulation can contain ascorbic acid (a hydroxylated fruit acid) from 25 to about 100mg (col. 6, lines 43-49).

Art Unit: 1623

The ascorbic acid used in the formulation can be conventional dry powder (anhydrous). Ascorbic acid is an antioxidant. However, Demopoulos does not teach a composition comprising mixed salts of glucosamine.

Scheck et al teach mixed salts of glucosamine sulfate and metal halides like potassium chloride are well known and that such mixed salts are used in compositions instead of glucosamine sulfate since glucosamine sulfate is unstable in view of its highly hygroscopic nature (col. 1, lines 18-28).

Rovati teaches a stable combined salt comprising glucosamine sulfate and glucosamine hydrochloride in the presence of a stabilizer (col. 5, lines 30-46).

The Merck Manual (entry # 2387) teaches that citric acid is a solid tricarboxylic hydroxy acid.

Chiesi et al drawn to effervescent pharmaceutical compositions, teaches the use of edible acids (fruit acids) in effervescent preparations (page 1, second and third paragraphs).

Scheck et al teach mixed salts of glucosamine sulfate and metal halides like potassium chloride are well known and that such mixed salts are used in compositions instead of glucosamine sulfate since glucosamine sulfate is unstable in view of its highly hygroscopic nature (col. 1, lines 18-28).

Stephan et al drawn to effervescent tablets, teach that effervescent preparations are dissolved and hence can include large quantities of the active ingredient and since the active ingredient ingested as a solution can be resorbed rapidly long term treatment of patients to produce uniform active substance level is possible (col. 1, lines 47-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the prior art above to make a solid formulation comprising glucosamine sulfate or a mixed salt of glucosamine sulfate hydrochloride or glucosamine sulfate potassium chloride, an aliphatic hydroxylated carboxylic acid like citric acid and an antioxidant as instantly claimed, with a reasonable amount of success since the active agents for the composition is seen to be disclosed in the prior art. Adjusting the ratios of the active agents based on the teachings of the prior art and using crystalline citric acid for making a solid formulation based on the teaching of the Merck manual (citric acid is a crystalline solid) is well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so since a composition comprising glucosamine sulfate or the mixed salts with a fruit acid and an antioxidant makes the glucosamine sulfate highly stable and less hygroscopic. Hence this combination would produce a composition that is highly stable in a solid dosage form, thereby overcoming the practical difficulty of using glucosamine sulfate like packaging and degradability (Demopoulos, col. 1, lines 25-43). In addition, according to Stephan, effervescent preparations have the advantage of using large quantities of the active agent and ingestion of the active agent as a solution has the benefit of rapid resorption.

Claims 32-34 are product by process claims, the product being the formulation of claim 15, which is a formulation comprising glucosamine sulfate or a mixed salt thereof in an effervescent preparation. The teachings of the prior art above render claims 32-34 obvious. "Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its

Art Unit: 1623

method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Conclusion

Claims 15-34 are rejected

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ganapathy Krishnan whose telephone number is 571-272-0654. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GK

James O. Wilson
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1623
